

Application No. 09/383,981

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14-18 and 20-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 12, 18 and 26 are amended, and dependent claims 30-33 are added. Support for the amendments can be at least found on pages 9 and 10 of the original specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) do not present any additional independent claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Wallerson during the September 14, 2005 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,240,456 to Teng et al. ("Teng") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083 to Savitzky et al. ("Savitzky"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Teng describes a method for providing the ability for a network client to submit data to a network server for performing a job on a printer or disk drive. When the network client receives a request to perform a job, it checks the address of the printer or disk drive and if the address is a URL, it sends a HTTP formatted message (col. 2, lines 45-60). Teng's method is

Application No. 09/383,981

preferably used for collecting printer or disk drive information for monitoring and administration purposes.

Teng merely describes a method of translating a user request into a network-transferable message and delivering the message to the intended device. The user input is not stored into memory accessible by the computer and made available for subsequent operations. Savitzky also fails to disclose storing user individualized instructions into memory accessible by the computer and providing the user selected individualized instructions upon a subsequent selection of one of the displayed printer routing instructions.

Thus, as discussed during the personal interview, Teng and Savitzky both fail to disclose, *inter alia*, storing user selected individualized instructions in the memory accessible by the computer, and providing the stored user selected individualized instructions upon a subsequent selection of one of the displayed printer routing options, as recited in independent claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent claim 26.

For at least these reasons, Teng alone or in combination with Savitzky, fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 26, as well as claims 6, 7, 9 and 27 which depend therefrom. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, 10 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Teng in view of Savitzky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568 to Tonkin. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claims 3, 5, 10 and 28 respectively, depend from independent claims 1 and 26 and are likewise patentable over the applied art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Teng in view of Savitzky, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0011806 A1 to Shiohara. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claims 23 and 29 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 26 and are likewise patentable over the

Application No. 09/383,981

applied art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Teng in view of Savitzky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,070 to Cheng. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and is likewise patentable over the applied art for at least its dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features it recites. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Teng in view of Savitzky, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,085 to Bellucco. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Claim 11 depends from independent claim 1 and is likewise patentable over the applied art for at least its dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features it recites. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 15-18, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tonkin in view of Shiohara and further in view of Savitzky; and claims 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Tonkin in view of Shiohara and Savitzky, and further in view of Bellucco. The rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. The Office Action asserts that Tonkin discloses all the features of claims 12, 14-18, 20-22, 24 and 25 except for deficiencies, which are allegedly cured by one or more of Shiohara, Savitzky and Bellucco.

As discussed during the personal interview, neither Tonkin, Shiohara nor Savitzky discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, a fifth module to store user selected individualized print order data in a memory accessible by the computer and to provide the user selected individualized print order data upon a subsequent selection of one of the printer routing options, as recited in independent claims 12 and 18. For at least these reasons, Applicants

Application No. 09/383,981

respectfully submit that the combination of Tonkin, Shiohara and Savitzky, fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 12 and 18. It is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 15-17, 21, 22, 24 and 25 respectively depend from independent claims 12 and 18 and are likewise patentable over the applied art for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 30-33 add no new matter and are patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to independent claims 1, 12, 18, and 26.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 09/383,981

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Maryam M. Ipakchi

Registration No. 51,835

JAO:MMI/ccs

Attachment:

Amendment Transmittal

Date: September 14, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037